AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.116 – EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
Serial Number: 10/020,335
Filing Date: December 12, 2001
Title: SECURITY SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR VISUAL DISPLAY
Assignee: Intel Corporation

Page 11
Dkt: 884.608US1 (INTEL)

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on March 24, 2004.

Claims 2 and 47 have been canceled, and claims 1 and 46 have been amended. As a result, claims 1, 3-46, and 48 are now pending in this application.

For the convenience of the Examiner, Applicant's remarks concerning the claims will be presented in the same order in which the Examiner presented them in the Office Action.

Amendments to the Abstract

The Abstract has been amended to more accurately describe the disclosed subject matter. In the first sentence, the phrase "displayed information" has been substituted for "the document". In the second sentence, the "a user" has been substituted for "the user". In the fifth sentence, "a particular software application" has been substituted for "the particular software application", and "an operating system" has been substituted for "the operating system". No new matter has been introduced through these amendments to the Abstract.

Amendments to Claims 1 and 46

Claims 1 and 46 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced.

The amendments to the claims are made for the purpose of clarification, and they are not intended to limit the scope of equivalents to which any claim element may be entitled.

In independent claim 1, the subject matter of claim 2 has been incorporated, except that the data attributes of date, color, and intensity have been deleted. In addition, "responsive to a value of the at least one data attribute" has been substituted for "if at least one data attribute specifies that the data should be modified". Support for this amendment may be found, for example, in the specification beginning on page 5, line 24, and ending on page 7, line 2.

In independent claim 46, "responsive to a value of" has been substituted for "if"; "selected from the group consisting of font size, font type, boldface, italics, and underlining" has been added; and "specifies that the data should be modified" has been deleted. Support for this amendment may be found in the same location as indicated above regarding the amendments to claim 1.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.116 – EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
Serial Number: 10/020,335
Filing Date: December 12, 2001
Title: SECURITY SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR VISUAL DISPLAY
Assignee: Intel Corporation

Page 12
Dkt: 884.608US1 (INTEL)

Rejection of Claims 1-29, 32, 36, 38 and 46-48
under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)
as Anticipated by Parikh

Claims 1-29, 32, 36, 38 and 46-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Parikh et al. (U.S. 5,801,697).

Parikh discloses an information security feature for a laptop computer, in which a visible area (50, FIG. 2) within an overall obscured area (52, FIG. 2) may be defined by user action, e.g. by moving a mouse pointer or in various other ways (col. 2, lines 64-67). The appearance of the obscured area may be varied by the user, e.g. by altering the color or intensity (col. 2, lines 47-51). The user can designate a predefined area to always remain visible, e.g., a date or title (col. 3, lines 1-6). The size of the visible area may be varied by the user (col. 3, lines 35-37).

Applicant's claimed subject matter is patentably distinguishable from that of Parikh, because in Applicant's claim 1, for example, modified data having reduced legibility is created in response to the value of at least one data attribute from the group consisting of font, paragraph, page, document, user name, user location, device name, time, style name, data type, text, field, file name, cell, size, shape, angular orientation, and position. Parikh, as understood, does not appear to form modified data, for subsequent display having reduced legibility, responsive to a value of at least one data attribute from the recited Markush group of data attributes.

In Parikh, the user may select an option to alter the appearance of the obscured area by altering the color or intensity. The user may also select an option for the date or title to remain legible. In Applicant's claim 1, data is not made illegible in response to values of color, intensity, date, or title, as disclosed in Parikh.

In contrast to Parikh's disclosure, in Applicant's inventive subject matter, as recited for example in claim 1, control to modify data for subsequent display is specified by a value of at least one data attribute, whether or not the value was input by the user. In an example discussed on page 6, lines 14-18 of Applicant's written description, a font attribute (e.g. font type, such as "italics") may be used to specify that the data should be modified, e.g. blurring the displayed data. In another example in Applicant's written description, a different font attribute (e.g. font size, such as "large") can be used to specify that the data should be modified, e.g. blurring the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.116 – EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
Serial Number: 10/020,335
Filing Date: December 12, 2001
Title: SECURITY SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR VISUAL DISPLAY
Assignee: Intel Corporation

Page 13
Dkt: 884.608US1 (INTEL)

displayed data. As further examples, if any of the user location, device name, or file name have a given value, then data may be rendered illegible.

In Applicant's inventive subject matter, any data comprising at least one of the recited data attributes may result in modifying the data for reduced legibility, or for restored legibility, depending upon the value of the at least one data attribute. The data attribute value need not have been created or selected by a user of a device on which the method is performed, because the data may have been in the device before the user operated it, or the data may have been received by the device in the form of information over a network.

The rule under 35 U.S.C. §102 is well settled that "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2D 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). MPEP §2131.

Parikh doesn't disclose all of the elements recited in claim 1, as amended. For example, Parikh doesn't disclose "modifying the data to form modified data, responsive to a value of the at least one data attribute" from the defined Markush group.

For the above reasons, claim 1 should be found to be allowable over Parikh, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Parikh be withdrawn.

Claims 3-7, 32, 36, and 38, which depend from claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations therein, are also asserted to be allowable for the reasons presented above, and Applicant respectfully requests notification of same.

Regarding independent claims 8, 15 and 22, Applicant continues to assert their patentability over the art of record, including Parikh. However, in the event that independent claim 1 is found to be allowable but the rejection of independent claims 8, 15, and 22 is maintained, Applicant would consider making corresponding amendments to claims 8, 15 and 22.

Regarding independent claim 46, Parikh fails to disclose "modifying the data to form modified data, responsive to a value of at least one font attribute selected from the group consisting of font size, font type, boldface, italics, and underlining". Thus, claim 46 should be

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.116 – EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
Serial Number: 10/020,335
Filing Date: December 12, 2001
Title: SECURITY SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR VISUAL DISPLAY
Assignee: Intel Corporation

Page 14
Dkt: 884.608US1 (INTEL)

found to be allowable over Parikh, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Parikh be withdrawn.

In addition, all of the claims dependent upon independent claims 8, 15, 22, and 46 should be allowable, and Applicant respectfully requests notification of same.

Rejection of Claims 30, 31, 33-35, 37 and 39-45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as Unpatentable over Parikh

Claims 30, 31, 33-35, 37 and 39-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Parikh. Claims 30, 31, 33-35, 37 and 39-45 are all dependent upon claim 1.

Parikh was discussed previously.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest every limitation of the claim. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA, 1974). MPEP §2143.

The asserted rejection based upon Parikh fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations present in independent claim 1, as amended, so a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

For example, regarding independent claim 1, Parikh fails to disclose "modifying the data to form modified data, responsive to a value of the at least one data attribute" from the defined Markush group.

In the most recent Office Action, the Examiner asserts that data attributes, such as those recited in Applicant's claims, are well known in the art and are each capable of being used by Parikh as an obvious intended use. In response, Applicant respectfully points out that in Parikh the user is apparently limited to selecting options regarding color, intensity, date, and title regarding data that has already been modified for display. In Applicant's subject matter, recited in claim 1 for example, it is the value of the at least one data attribute that determines whether data is to be modified and displayed with or without legibility. Thus, broadly speaking, in Parikh the user may alter the appearance of the end result (i.e. blurring), whereas in Applicant's claim 1 it is the data attribute value that determines the end result (whether or not to make legible).

For the above reasons, independent claim 1 should be found to be allowable over Parikh.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.116 – EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
Serial Number: 10/020,335
Filing Date: December 12, 2001
Title: SECURITY SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR VISUAL DISPLAY
Assignee: Intel Corporation

Page 15
Dkt: 884.608US1 (INTEL)

If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. MPEP §2143.03.

Claims 30, 31, 33-35, 37 and 39-45, which depend from claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations therein, are thus asserted to be allowable for the reasons presented above, and Applicant respectfully requests notification of same.

Additional Elements and Limitations

Applicant considers additional elements and limitations of claims 1, 3-46, and 48 to further distinguish over the applied reference, and Applicant reserves the right to present arguments to this effect at a later date.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.116 – EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
Serial Number: 10/020,335
Filing Date: December 12, 2001
Title: SECURITY SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR VISUAL DISPLAY
Assignee: Intel Corporation

Page 16
Dkt: 884.608US1 (INTEL)

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3-46, and 48 are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney, Walter W. Nielsen (located in Phoenix, Arizona) at (602) 298-8920, or the below-signed attorney (located in Minneapolis, Minnesota) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

EDWARD O. CLAPPER

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 373-6970

Date _May 24, 2004_

By _Charles E. Steffey_
Charles E. Steffey
Reg. No. 25,179

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this ___24th___ day of _May 2004._

ANNE M. RICHARDS

Name

Anne M. Richards

Signature